

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed December 10, 2007 and the telephone interview on January 17, 2008.

The examiner stated that should claims 5-7 be found allowable, claims 28-30 and 48-50 will be objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being substantial duplicate thereof.

Claims 5-7, 28-30 and 48-50 depend on different independent claims so are thus believed to have different claim scopes.

Claims 1-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al. (US patent 6,327,628).

Claims 1, 21, 41, 59 and 80 have been amended to include the feature that “a descendent of the first control can override the them with a second theme such that the descendent of the first control uses the second theme and any descendent of the descendent of the first control uses the second theme unless the second theme is overridden”.

This feature is not shown in the prior art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 29, 2008

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800